REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 are in the application. Claims 1, 13, and 17 - 19 are currently amended and claims 2 - 12, 14 - 16, and 20 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1, 13, and 17 - 19 are the independent claims herein.

Claims 1, 13, and 17 - 19 are each currently amended to clarify that which is claimed by Applicants. In particular, each of the independent claims now include recitations to clarify that, "said first platform and said second platform are different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first and second platforms". Support for the amendments may be found in the specification, as indicated in the corresponding U.S. Patent App. Pub. U.S. 20030046309 A1 at paragraphs 0037, lines 3 - 8 and 0040, lines 10 – 12. Accordingly, no new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1 - 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over by Weissman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524 B1 (hereinafter, Weissman) in view of Thompson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 (hereinafter, Thompson). This rejection is traversed.

In response to the rejection of claims 1 - 20, and since claims 13 - 20 were rejected for the same grounds as those relating to the rejection of claims 1 - 12, Applicant first addresses the rejection of claims 1 - 12. In particular, Applicant notes that independent claim 1 states,

> receiving initial data from <u>said first and said second platforms, wherein said first platform and said second platform are different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first and second platforms</u>;
> <u>generating</u>, using a computer, <u>a staging table</u> to store said initial data and track changes, additions, and rejections of said initial data; and
> associating standardized data with said initial data using said computer. (emphasis added)

Clearly, Applicant claims a method of aggregating and maintaining data in a system having at least a first and a second platform generating data that includes receiving initial data from a first platform, receiving initial data from a second platform, and generating a staging table. It is also clear from the plain language of the claims that the recited first and second platforms are distinct and different from each other, as well as being distinct from the recited staging table. Further support of the distinctiveness of these three different claimed aspects may be had by reference to Applicant's specification.

In contrast to the claims, the Office Action cites and relies upon Weissman to disclose a first platform, a second platform, and a staging table. Specifically, the Office Action cites 'source systems 110' as disclosing the first platform, and cites and relies upon 'staging tables 130' for allegedly disclosing the second platform and the staging table. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon staging table is not disclosed as being a platform (e.g., a program application). The Weissman disclosed staging table is not a second platform from which initial data is received since the staging table is instead populated with the data from the source systems 110.

Furthermore, the Weissman staging table, though not that same as Applicant's claimed staging table, is not both a "platform" and a "staging table". Clearly, the cited and relied upon Weissman staging table is not both a staging table and a platform within the meaning of the claimed method or the Weissman disclosure. In fact, to interpret the Weissman staging table as a "platform" would be contrary to the clear disclosure and intent of Weissman. That is, to read Weissman's staging table as a platform is impermissible.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon Weissman does not disclose the claimed first and second platforms wherein the first platform and the second platform are different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first and second platforms. The single platform of Weissman, the

source systems 110, appear to provide data that is similarly formatted and indexed. According to Weissman, a schema is used to determine the predefined data semantics to which the data from the source systems is converted. (See Weissman, col. 8, ln. 54 57)

The Office Action cites and relies upon Thompson for disclosing a table to track changes, additions, and rejections of initial data. However, given the significant and clear shortcomings of Weissman discussed in detail above, the combination of Weissman and Thompson does not render claim 1 obvious.

Claims 2 -12 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Weisman and Thompson do not render claims 1 – 12 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that clams 13 – 20 are also patentable over Weissman and Thompson for at least the same reasons provided regarding claims 1 – 12.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

June 12, 2006
Date

Randolph P. Calhoune
Registration No. 45,371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985